

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 13, 22 and 26 are amended in order to emphasize the location of the persons or passengers at a common venue, such as a plane, boat, bus or the like, and the location of the equipment for communication individually or by address system at that common venue.

Advisory Action

In the Advisory Action dated March 13, 2009, the Examiner utilizes a broad interpretation of the word "respective" as used in the claims to identify an individual location of a person or passenger within a single common venue or transport platform. The Examiner, in applying Rankin, states that "the applicant's argument seems to be that because the users are all located on the transport platform, e.g. the bus, the location of the bus is not a "respective" identifiable location, because the location is common to everyone on the bus. The examiner believes a fair interpretation of the word "respective" to be "particular, or separate". Claim 1 requires each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations". The location of the transport platform may be fairly considered to be a "respective identifiable location" because the current location of the transport platform is particular or separate to its current position along a route. For example, in [0067], travelers on a bus have "respective identifiable locations" which are spaced apart at various distances as the bus proceeds along the route. The locations are "respective" in the sense that each location is particular or separate, for example, in terms of GPS position. Each of the plurality of persons on the bus has the same "respective" identifiable location because they are on the bus. In other words, each passenger on the bus has a particular and separate location that changes with respect to time as the bus travels. Even if one were to interpret "respective" such to require a particular and separate location of each user is required in claim 1, the claim would still not be patentably distinct from Rankin, who teaches in [0095], tagging messages from a particular user with a specific location. Such message tagging may also be useful for user terminals receiving messages left by other users to enable selection of only recent messages or those from particular persons known to be in specific locations". This explicitly teaches "respective identifiable locations" in the same sense as the applicant's

interpretation because the location tags are particular to the user and specific to the particular user's location.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

With respect to claim 1, the claim now has been amended to make clear that the respective locations are relative to other persons or passengers at the same venue. Further, the claim has been amended to define the source at the same venue. This amendment clearly defines the invention over Rankin et al.

The Examiner cannot deny that the concepts in Rankin and the present invention are fundamentally different. To the extent that the Examiner still maintains an interpretation of the claim language that somehow relates to the arrangement in Rankin, Applicants respectfully request an interview where appropriate language that defines the invention over Rankin can be developed.

Claim 22

The claim is also directed to a multi-language communication method and is specifically limited by the preamble to passengers on a vehicle where each of the plurality of passengers has “respective identifiable locations.” The steps that comprise limitations in the body of the claim directly tie the recited step to the respective identifiable locations of each person. The claim now has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. Again, any need for further clarification to distinguish the clearly different method of the present invention from Rankin can be discussed in an interview.

Claims 2-5, 7, 12, 13, 17, 20, 21, 23-26, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of Poch (5,152, 003). This rejection should be traversed for at least the following reasons.

These claims, which depend from claims 1 or 22, or otherwise have been amended to incorporate the limitations added to claims 1 and 22, would be patentable for the reasons given or on the basis of language defined in an interview.

Claims 6, 16, 27, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Li et al. (6,205,418).

Claims 6, 16, and 27

These claims would be patentable by virtue of their dependency from allowable parent claims.

Claim 32

This claim would be patentable for reasons given for claim 6 above, and because of its dependence on allowable claim 26.

Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Glenn (6,434,518).

Claim 8

Glenn does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin or Poch, and is cited for limited purposes. Thus, this claim would be patentable for reasons already given for parent claim 5.

Claim 10

Glenn does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin or Poch, and is cited for limited purposes. Thus, this claim would be patentable for reasons already given for parent claim 5.

Claims 9, 11, 14, 15, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Kumano (5,978,754).

Claims 9 and 11

Kumano does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin or Poch, and is cited for limited purposes. Thus, this claim would be patentable for reasons already given for parent claim 5.

Moreover, the multi-language feature of Rankin does not depend on translation, but is based upon pre-recorded public announcements concurrently in several languages. This system would be incompatible with, or at least would not need, the translation capability of Kumano. Further, for text messages, the local device being a personal PDA, PC or the like would not have such capability as part of the system contemplated by Rankin.

Claim 14

Kumano does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin or Poch, and is cited for limited purposes. Thus, this claim would be patentable for reasons already given for parent claim 13.

Claim 15

Kumano does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin or Poch, and is cited for limited purposes. Thus, this claim would be patentable for reasons already given for parent claim 13.

Claims 18 and 19

Kumano does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin or Poch, and is cited for limited purposes. Thus, this claim would be patentable for reasons already given for parent claim 13.

Conclusion

In sum, the basic system and method approach of Rankin is clearly different from that of the present invention.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No. 10/540,920

Attorney Docket No. Q83222

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan J. Kasper/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Alan J. Kasper
Registration No. 25,426

Date: April 27, 2009